

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of June 23, 2008 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 20, 23, 28, 30 and 31 have been examined. These have been objected to and rejected as follows: claim 28 is objected to because "its respective measurement module" at lines 9 and 12 of claim 28 "lack antecedent basis;" claims 30, 20 and 23 are rejected as indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because of the "broad, narrow" principle; claim 28 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) by Sunshine et al in view of Horowitz and Hill; and (apparently) claim 31 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a), also by Sunshine et al in view of Horowitz and Hill.

Claims 28, 30 and 31 have been amended for the purpose of overcoming the noted objection and rejection under 35 USC 112. The rejections under 35 USC 103(a) have been carefully considered and are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's reasoning concerning claim 28 ignores several limitations contained in claim 28, namely:

- a selection line assigned to each measurement module for connecting its respective measurement module to said central unit; and
- each measurement module is selectable by said central unit by a selection line.

Indeed, these features are neither disclosed or suggested by Sunshine et al or Horowitz. The measuring device according to claim 28 (and as shown in Fig. 1 and described in the specification of this application) has a central unit that acts via selection lines both on the multiplexer and on the measurement modules.

Sunshine et al does not explicitly disclose selection lines acting on a multiplexer. Furthermore Sunshine et al does not disclose selection lines connecting both the multiplexer and the sensor modules with the central unit.

Horowitz discloses selection lines (channel select in) acting on a multiplexer via an address counter. However, Horowitz does not disclose that these selection lines are connected with a central unit. Horowitz does not disclose that the very same selection lines are also connected to the measurement modules so that each measurement module is selectable by the central unit by the selection line.

Thus, the proposed combination of Sunshine et al and Horowitz fails to disclose or suggest all the features of current claim 28, and in particular the two distinguishing features noted above.

Regarding claim 30, neither Sunshine et al nor Horowitz teaches selecting a measurement module by a central unit over a selection line and transmitting data from the central unit over a central transmission line and transmitting data from the central unit over a central transmission line to all measurement modules, wherein only the measurement module selected by means of the selection line utilizes the data sent from the central unit.

In fact, the central transmission line disclosed in Sunshine et al (connection between A/D converter 230 and computer 235 in Fig. 2) is not used to transfer data from a central unit to measurement modules. Horowitz et al does not disclose a central transmission line for transmitting data from the central unit to the measurement modules at all. Thus, even a combination of both references does not lead to the method according to claim 30.


U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/510,072

In claim 31, a "cycle" is a communication cycle (see page 8 of the specification). All measurement modules connected to the central unit are selected (at least) once in one communication cycle. Thus, claim 31 defines an operating method comprising the step of selecting all the measurement modules at least once in every communication cycle, wherein at least one measurement module is selected a plurality of times within one communication cycle. This operating method is not taught or suggested by the references of record.

Since receiving the Office Action of June 23, 2008, a SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT and a FURTHER INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT have been filed. These documents have been filed to bring to the attention of the examiner the prosecution of the corresponding Chinese application (which cites two U.S. patents already of record in this case) and to cited one further U.S. patent No. 6,574,515 which may disclose a device which is closer to the present invention than the other references of record, but still lacks the distinctions noted above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 20, 23, 28, 30 and 31 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Registration No: 25,721

Date: September 23, 2008

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\fd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\GUNZ3001 - CD0162\Sept 23 2008 Response.wpd